

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINAEFC:JW  
USDC CLE 060830 PM 10:00 AM

Vincent L. Barr, # 245797, ) C/A No. 2:06-cv-02209-CMC-RSC  
                                )  
                                Plaintiff, )  
                                )  
vs.                            ) Report and Recommendation  
                                )  
John Battiste,              )  
                                )  
                                Defendant. )

---

Plaintiff, a pre-trial detainee at the Williamsburg County Detention Center, has filed this matter pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff alleges he is “in fear of loss of life or limb” because his cell block and “rec area” are “out of sight and sound of any officer”. Plaintiff also wants to “swear out” warrants for the defendants because he alleges they have “upgraded” his shoplifting charge from a misdemeanor to a felony. Plaintiff asserts that defendant Shaw, a police officer, has violated South Carolina law through “false swearing”, and that Shaw and defendant Battiste, the jail administrator, have conspired to violate his civil rights. According to the complaint and the accompanying exhibits this is plaintiff’s sixth (6<sup>th</sup>) shoplifting charge.

Plaintiff further claims he is a mental patient and is not getting his lithium. He maintains that he has a chronic skin disease on his face, scalp, chest and back for which he is not receiving treatment. Plaintiff alleges he has exhausted his prison remedies for these medical issues. In his prayer for relief he asks that the warrants

for the defendants issue, that he be released from jail, and that the defendants correct the "unsafe living conditions". He also seeks damages.

Under established local procedure in this judicial district, a careful review has been made of the *pro se* complaint pursuant to the procedural provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915, 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, and the Prison Litigation Reform Act. The review has been conducted in light of the following precedents: Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 112 S.Ct. 1728, 118 L.Ed.2d 340, 60 U.S.L.W. 4346 (1992); Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 324-325, (1989); Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519 (1972); Nasim v. Warden, Maryland House of Correction, 64 F.3d 951, (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1995)(*en banc*), *cert. denied*, Nasim v. Warden, Maryland House of Correction, 516 U.S. 1177 (1996); Todd v. Baskerville, 712 F.2d 70 (4th Cir. 1983); and Boyce v. Alizaduh, 595 F.2d 948 (4th Cir. 1979). *Pro se* complaints are held to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys, Gordon v. Leeke, 574 F.2d 1147, 1151 (4th Cir.), *cert. denied*, Leeke v. Gordon, 439 U.S. 970 (1978), and a federal district court is charged with liberally construing a complaint filed by a *pro se* litigant to allow the development of a potentially meritorious case. See Hughes v. Rowe, 449 U.S. 5, 9 (1980); and Cruz v. Beto, 405 U.S. 319 (1972). When a federal court is evaluating a *pro se* complaint the plaintiff's allegations are assumed to be true. Fine v. City of New York, 529 F.2d 70, 74 (2nd Cir. 1975). However, even under this less stringent standard, the complaint submitted in the above-captioned case is subject to summary dismissal.

The requirement of liberal construction does not mean that the court can ignore a clear failure in the pleading to allege facts which set forth a claim currently cognizable in a federal district court. Weller v. Department of Social Services, 901 F.2d 387, (4th Cir. 1990).

Insofar as the plaintiff's pre-trial detention and pre-trial proceedings are concerned, the § 1983 complaint is subject to summary dismissal because a right of action with respect to the plaintiff's detention and pending criminal proceedings has not yet accrued. See Heck v. Humphrey, 512 U.S. 477 (1994):

We hold that, in order to recover damages for allegedly unconstitutional conviction or imprisonment, or for other harm whose unlawfulness would render a conviction or sentence invalid, . . . a § 1983 plaintiff must prove that the conviction or sentence has been reversed on direct appeal, expunged by executive order, declared invalid by a state tribunal authorized to make such a determination, or called into question by a federal court's issuance of a writ of habeas corpus, 28 U.S.C. § 2254. A claim for damages bearing that relationship to a conviction or sentence that has not been so invalidated is not cognizable under § 1983. Thus, when a state prisoner seeks damages in a § 1983 suit, the district court must consider whether a judgment in favor of the plaintiff would necessarily imply the invalidity of his conviction or sentence; if it would, the complaint must be dismissed unless the plaintiff can demonstrate that the conviction or sentence has already been invalidated.

See also Schafer v. Moore, 46 F.3d 43 (8th Cir., January 27, 1995) ("Therefore, in light of *Heck*, the complaint was properly dismissed for failure to state a claim."); and Woods v. Candela, 47 F.3d 545, (2nd Cir. 1995) (plaintiff's conviction reversed by state court in 1993; hence, civil rights action timely filed), *cert. denied*, Candela v.

Woods, 516 U.S. 808 (1995). *See also Brooks v. City of Winston-Salem, N.C.*, 85 F.3d 178 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1996). *Accord Smith v. Holtz*, 879 F. Supp. 435 (M.D.Pa., March 24, 1995); Burnside v. Mathis, 2004 WL 2944092 (D.S.C. 2004).

Although the decision in Heck v. Humphrey concerned a conviction, its rationale is also applicable to pre-trial detainees. *See Nelson v. Murphy*, 44 F.3d 497 (7th Cir. 1995)("[A]n inmate already participating in state litigation must make his stand there rather than attempt the equivalent of federal-defense removal by filing an independent § 1983 suit."); Norris v. Super Cab Co., 1994 WESTLAW® 665193 (N.D.Cal., November 15, 1994); and Daniel v. Ruph, 1994 WESTLAW® 589352 (N.D.Cal., October 12, 1994).

In Daniel v. Ruph, *supra*, a district court applied the holding in Heck v. Humphrey to a pre-trial detainee:

In this case, plaintiff seeks damages under § 1983 based on a violation of his Sixth Amendment right to put on a meaningful defense. A judgment in favor of the plaintiff on that claim would imply the invalidity of his ongoing criminal proceedings. If plaintiff were successful in showing that he had been denied his constitutional right to prepare his defense, any conviction which flowed from that denial would be invalidated. Therefore, the instant allegations fail to state a cognizable claim under § 1983 and are DISMISSED without prejudice.

\* \* \*

Daniel v. Ruph, *supra*, 1994 WESTLAW® 589352 (footnote following quotation omitted). In an earlier case, Norris v. Patsy, 1994 WESTLAW® 443456 (N.D.Cal., July 29, 1994), the court noted that, under Heck v. Humphrey, *supra*, "[a] judgment

in favor of the plaintiff here would imply the invalidity of pending state criminal proceedings which have not already been invalidated; . . . therefore, any request for damages pertinent to said proceedings is premature and must be DISMISSED."

Also on point is Hudson v. Chicago Police Department, 860 F. Supp. 521 (N.D.Ill. 1994), where the Honorable Marvin E. Aspen, United States District Judge, ruled that the complaint was subject to dismissal under Heck v. Humphrey. Judge Aspen, however, noted that the plaintiff could bring § 1983 action at a later date if a cause of action had accrued. Judge Aspen also held that "federal courts will not entertain a claim for damages under § 1983 if disposition of the claim would entail ruling on issues in dispute in pending state proceedings." *Accord Babcock v. Collord, supra*, 1994 WESTLAW® 374528 (complaints subject to dismissal under Heck v. Humphrey can be dismissed under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d)).

Heck v. Humphrey is controlling in the above-captioned case because the events at issue in this case took place after Heck v. Humphrey was decided. In any event, Heck v. Humphrey would apply retroactively. *See Hooper v. Anderson*, 50 F.3d 14 (9th Cir., January 10, 1995)(opinion on rehearing by panel; Heck v. Humphrey applies retroactively), replacing unpublished opinion reported in Hooper v. Anderson, 37 F.3d 1505 (9th Cir., October 6, 1994); and Smith v. Holtz, supra (plaintiff's Rule 60(b) motion granted because of decision in Heck v. Humphrey).

Absent extraordinary circumstances, federal district courts are not authorized

to interfere with a State's pending criminal proceedings. *See, e.g., Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37, 44 (1971); *Taylor v. Taintor*, 83 U.S. 366, 370 & n. 8 (1873);\* *Harkrader v. Wadley*, 172 U.S. 148, 169-170 (1898); and *Cinema Blue of Charlotte, Inc. v. Gilchrist*, 887 F.2d 49, 50-53 (4th Cir. 1989), *cert. denied*, 494 U.S. 1030 (1990). In *Cinema Blue of Charlotte, Inc. v. Gilchrist*, the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit ruled that federal district courts should abstain from constitutional challenges to state judicial proceedings, no matter how meritorious, if the federal claims have been or could be presented in an ongoing state judicial proceeding. *Cinema Blue of Charlotte, Inc. v. Gilchrist*, *supra*, 887 F.2d at 52. *See also Bonner v. Circuit Court of St. Louis*, 526 F.2d 1331, 1336 (8th Cir. 1975)(*en banc*), *cert. denied*, 424 U.S. 946 (1976). In *Bonner v. Circuit Court of St. Louis*, the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit pointed out that federal constitutional claims are cognizable in both state courts and in federal courts: "Congress and the federal courts have consistently recognized that federal courts should permit state courts to try state cases, and that, where constitutional issues arise, state court judges are fully competent to handle them subject to Supreme Court review."

As for plaintiff's allegations that he is not being properly protected from other inmates, these allegations are duplicative of those made in two other recent cases filed

---

\*Although the Supreme Court of the United States has not overruled *Taylor v. Taintor*, an unrelated portion of the decision in *Taylor v. Taintor*, which concerned the right of sureties to apprehend principals, has been superannuated by statute in Texas. *See Green v. State*, 829 S.W.2d 222, 223 (Tex. Crim. App. 1992) ("However, *Taylor* is not the law in Texas."), *affirming Green v. State*, 785 S.W.2d 955 (Tex. App. Fort Worth 1990).

by the plaintiff: Civil Action Nos. 2:06-2284-CMC-RSC, and 2:06-2355-CMC-RSC. This court may take judicial notice of Civil Action Nos. 2:06-2284-CMC-RSC, and 2:06-2355-CMC-RSC. Aloe Creme Laboratories, Inc. v. Francine Co., 425 F.2d 1295, 1296 (5th Cir. 1970). The issues pertaining to plaintiff's safety are subject to summary dismissal because they are already being addressed by this court. *See Aloe Creme Laboratories, Inc. v. Francine Co., supra*, where the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit commented:

The District Court clearly had the right to take notice of its own files and records and it had no duty to grind the same corn a second time. Once was sufficient.

Aloe Creme Laboratories, Inc. v. Francine Co., supra, 425 F.2d at 1296. *See also United States v. Parker*, 956 F.2d 169, 171 (8th Cir. 1992).

The plaintiff has also requested that criminal action be taken against the named defendants. A private citizen however, does not have a judicially cognizable interest in the prosecution or non-prosecution of another person. *See Linda R.S. v. Richard D.*, 410 U.S. 614, 619 (1973). The plaintiff, however, can not seek to prosecute the defendants on behalf of himself or others. *See Linda R.S. v. Richard D.*, 410 U.S. 614, 619 (1973)(a private citizen does not have a judicially cognizable interest in the prosecution or non-prosecution of another person); Diamond v. Charles, 476 U.S. 54, 64-65 (1986)(*applying Linda R.S. v. Richard D.* and collecting cases); Doyle v. Oklahoma State Bar Ass'n, 998 F.2d 1559, 1566-1567 (10th Cir. 1993); Lane v.

Correll, 434 F.2d 598, 600 (5th Cir. 1970); and Neitzke v. Williams, *supra* (although district courts should not blur the distinction between the standards applicable to a Rule 12(b)(6) dismissal for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted and a dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915 because a claim is frivolous, a patently insubstantial complaint may be dismissed). Cf. Community for Creative Non-Violence v. Pierce, 252 U.S.App.D.C. 37, 786 F.2d 1199, 1201-1202 (D.C.Cir. 1986)(denying motion to disqualify Office of the United States Attorney); and Collins v. Palczewski, 841 F. Supp. 333, 340 (D.Nev. 1993) ("Long ago the courts of these United States established that 'criminal statutes cannot be enforced by civil actions.'"). Secondly, since the plaintiff does not have a judicially cognizable interest in the criminal prosecution of another person, the plaintiff lacks standing to raise such a claim. Linda R.S. v. Richard D., *supra*, 410 U.S. at 619.

Closely on point is Leeke v. Timmerman, 454 U.S. 83, 86-87 (1981), which arose in South Carolina. In Leeke v. Timmerman, inmates who were allegedly beaten by prison guards sought criminal arrest warrants against the guards. The inmates presented sworn statements to a state magistrate, but the state magistrate, upon a Solicitor's request, declined to issue the warrants. In Leeke v. Timmerman, the Supreme Court of the United States reiterated its earlier holding in Linda R.S. v. Richard D., *supra*, and again ruled that a private citizen lacks a judicially cognizable interest in the criminal prosecution of other persons. Leeke v. Timmerman, *supra*,

454 U.S. at 86-87. Moreover, in its opinion in Leeke v. Timmerman, the Supreme Court of the United States cited a similar precedent from the Supreme Court of South Carolina. *See Leeke v. Timmerman, supra*, 454 U.S. at 87 n. 2, *citing State v. Addison*, 2 S.C. 356, 364 (1871). Thus, defendant Shaw would be entitled to summary dismissal.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Accordingly, it is recommended that the District Court dismiss all allegations raised in the complaint *without prejudice* and without issuance and service of process *except* those pertaining to plaintiff's claims that he is not receiving his lithium and is not being properly treated for his skin disorder. *See Denton v. Hernandez, supra; Neitzke v. Williams, supra; Haines v. Kerner, supra; Brown v. Briscoe*, 998 F.2d 201, 202-204 & n. \* (4th Cir. 1993), *replacing* unpublished opinion originally tabled at 993 F.2d 1535 (4th Cir. 1993); Boyce v. Alizaduh, supra; Todd v. Baskerville, supra, 712 F.2d at 74; 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B); and 28 U.S.C. § 1915A [the court shall review, as soon as practicable after docketing, prisoner cases to determine whether they are subject to any grounds for dismissal].

It is further recommended that defendant Shaw be dismissed as a party since he was not personally involved in the events that gave rise to plaintiff's medical issues. *See Wilson v. Cooper*, 922 F. Supp. 1286, 1293 (N.D.Ill. 1996); and Campo v. Keane, 913 F. Supp. 814, 825 & n. 11 (S.D.N.Y. 1996). *See also Horton v.*

Marovich, 925 F. Supp. 540 (N.D.Ill. 1996) ("Thus, a plaintiff suing a government official in his individual capacity and therefore seeking to hold the official personally liable must show that the official personally caused or played a role in causing the deprivation of a federal right.").



Robert S. Carr  
United States Magistrate Judge

August 29, 2006  
Charleston, South Carolina

The plaintiff's attention is directed to the important notice on the next page.

**Notice of Right to File Objections to Magistrate Judge's "Report and Recommendation"**  
**&**  
**The Serious Consequences of a Failure to Do So**

The parties are hereby notified that any objections to the attached Report and Recommendation (or Order and Recommendation) must be filed within ten (10) days of the date of service. 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). The time calculation of this ten-day period excludes weekends and holidays and provides for an additional three days for filing by mail. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6. A magistrate judge makes only a recommendation, and the authority to make a final determination in this case rests with the United States District Judge. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270-271 (1976); and Estrada v. Witkowski, 816 F. Supp. 408, 410, 1993 U.S.Dist. LEXIS® 3411 (D.S.C. 1993).

During the ten-day period for filing objections, but not thereafter, a party must file with the Clerk of Court specific, written objections to the Report and Recommendation, if he or she wishes the United States District Judge to consider any objections. Any written objections must *specifically identify* the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made *and the basis for such objections*. See Keeler v. Pea, 782 F. Supp. 42, 43-44, 1992 U.S.Dist. LEXIS® 8250 (D.S.C. 1992); and Oliverson v. West Valley City, 875 F. Supp. 1465, 1467, 1995 U.S.Dist. LEXIS® 776 (D.Utah 1995). Failure to file written objections shall constitute a waiver of a party's right to further judicial review, including appellate review, if the recommendation is accepted by the United States District Judge. See United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91, 94 & n. 4 (4th Cir.), cert. denied, Schronce v. United States, 467 U.S. 1208 (1984); and Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841, 845-847 & nn. 1-3 (4th Cir. 1985). Moreover, if a party files specific objections to a portion of a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, but does not file specific objections to other portions of the Report and Recommendation, that party waives appellate review of the portions of the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation to which he or she did not object. In other words, a party's failure to object to one issue in a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation precludes that party from subsequently raising that issue on appeal, even if objections are filed on other issues. Howard v. Secretary of HHS, 932 F.2d 505, 508-509, 1991 U.S.App. LEXIS® 8487 (6th Cir. 1991). See also Praylow v. Martin, 761 F.2d 179, 180 n. 1 (4th Cir.) (party precluded from raising on appeal factual issue to which it did not object in the district court), cert. denied, 474 U.S. 1009 (1985). In Howard, supra, the Court stated that general, non-specific objections are *not* sufficient:

A general objection to the entirety of the [magistrate judge's] report has the same effects as would a failure to object. The district court's attention is not focused on any specific issues for review, thereby making the initial reference to the [magistrate judge] useless. \* \* \* This duplication of time and effort wastes judicial resources rather than saving them, and runs contrary to the purposes of the Magistrates Act. \* \* \* We would hardly countenance an appellant's brief simply objecting to the district court's determination without explaining the source of the error.

*Accord* Lockert v. Faulkner, 843 F.2d 1015, 1017-1019 (7th Cir. 1988), where the Court held that the appellant, who proceeded *pro se* in the district court, was barred from raising issues on appeal that he did not specifically raise in his objections to the district court:

Just as a complaint stating only 'I complain' states no claim, an objection stating only 'I object' preserves no issue for review. \* \* \* A district judge should not have to guess what arguments an objecting party depends on when reviewing a [magistrate judge's] report.

*See also* Branch v. Martin, 886 F.2d 1043, 1046, 1989 U.S.App. LEXIS® 15,084 (8th Cir. 1989) ("no de novo review if objections are untimely or general"), which involved a *pro se* litigant; and Goney v. Clark, 749 F.2d 5, 7 n. 1 (3rd Cir. 1984) ("plaintiff's objections lacked the specificity to trigger *de novo* review"). This notice, hereby, apprises the plaintiff of the consequences of a failure to file specific, written objections. See Wright v. Collins, supra; and Small v. Secretary of HHS, 892 F.2d 15, 16, 1989 U.S.App. LEXIS® 19,302 (2nd Cir. 1989). Filing by mail pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections addressed as follows:

Larry W. Propes, Clerk  
 United States District Court  
 Post Office Box 835  
 Charleston, South Carolina 29402